arXiv:1406.5084v2 [math.CO] 9 Feb 2016

THE BERNARDI PROCESS AND TORSOR STRUCTURES ON SPANNING TREES

MATTHEW BAKER AND YAO WANG

ABSTRACT. Let G be a *ribbon graph*, i.e., a connected finite graph G together with a cyclic ordering of the edges around each vertex. By adapting a construction due to Olivier Bernardi, we associate to any pair (v, e) consisting of a vertex v and an edge e adjacent to v a bijection $\beta_{(v,e)}$ between spanning trees of G and elements of the set $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$ of degree g divisor classes on G, where g is the *genus* of G in the sense of Baker-Norine. We give a new proof that the map $\beta_{(v,e)}$ is bijective by explicitly constructing an inverse. Using the natural action of the Picard group $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$, we show that the Bernardi bijection $\beta_{(v,e)}$ gives rise to a simply transitive action β_v of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on the set of spanning trees which does not depend on the choice of e. A *plane graph* has a natural ribbon structure (coming from the counterclockwise orientation of the plane), and in this case we show that β_v is independent of v as well. Thus for plane graphs, the set of spanning trees is naturally a torsor for the Picard group. Conversely, we show that if β_v is independent of v then G together with its ribbon structure is planar. We also show that the natural action of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on spanning trees of a plane graph is compatible with planar duality.

These findings are formally quite similar to results of Holroyd et al. and Chan-Church-Grochow, who used *rotor-routing* to construct an action r_v of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on the spanning trees of a ribbon graph G, which they show is independent of v if and only if G is planar. It is therefore natural to ask how the two constructions are related. We prove that $\beta_v = r_v$ for all vertices v of G when G is a planar ribbon graph, i.e. the two torsor structures (Bernardi and rotor-routing) on the set of spanning trees coincide. In particular, it follows that the rotor-routing torsor is compatible with planar duality. We conjecture that for every non-planar ribbon graph G, there exists a vertex v with $\beta_v \neq r_v$.

1. INTRODUCTION

If G is a connected graph on n vertices, the *Picard group* $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ of G (also called the sandpile group, critical group, or Jacobian group) is a finite abelian group whose

We thank Spencer Backman, Melody Chan, and Dan Margalit for helpful discussions and feedback on an earlier draft. We also thank the anonymous referees for their careful proofreading and useful suggestions. This work began at the American Insitute of Mathematics workshop "Generalizations of chip firing and the critical group" in July 2013, and we would like to thank AIM as well as the organizers of that conference (L. Levine, J. Martin, D. Perkinson, and J. Propp) for providing a stimulating environment. The first author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1201473.

cardinality is the determinant of any $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ principal sub-minor of the Laplacian matrix of G. By Kirchhoff's Matrix-Tree Theorem, this quantity is equal to the number of spanning trees of G. There are several known families of bijections between spanning trees and elements of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$, which we think of as giving *bijective proofs* of Kirchhoff's Theorem – see for example [BS13] and the references therein. However, such bijections depend on various auxiliary choices, and there is no canonical bijection in general between $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ and the set $S(G)$ of spanning trees of G (see [CCG15, p. 2]).

Jordan Ellenberg asked if it might be the case that, under certain conditions, $S(G)$ is naturally a *torsor*[1] for $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$. This question was thoroughly studied in the paper [CCG15], where it was established via the *rotor-routing process* that given a *plane graph*[2] there is a canonical simply transitive action of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$. More generally, if one fixes a *ribbon structure* on G and then chooses a root vertex v, rotor-routing produces a simply transitive action r_v of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$ which is shown in [CCG15] to be independent of v *if and only if* G together with its ribbon structure is planar.

The first author learned of the results of [CCG15] at a 2013 AIM workshop on "Generalizations of Chip Firing", and at the same workshop he learned about an interesting family of bijections due to Olivier Bernardi [Ber08] between spanning trees, root-connected out-degree sequences, and recurrent sandpile configurations. Bernardi's bijections depend on choosing a ribbon structure, a root vertex v, and an edge e adjacent to v. It was natural to ask whether Bernardi's bijections became torsor structures upon forgetting the edge e, and whether the resulting torsor was again independent of v in the planar case. The present paper answers these questions affirmatively. Specifically, given a ribbon graph G, we show that:

(1) (Theorem 4.1) Fixing a vertex v, the Bernardi process defines a simply transitive action β_v of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$.
(2) (Theorems 5.1 and 5.2) The action β_v is independent of v if and only if the ribbon graph G is planar.
(3) (Theorem 7.1) If G is planar, the Bernardi and rotor-routing torsors coincide.

We also give an example which shows that if G is non-planar then β_v and r_v do not in general coincide. In fact, we conjecture that if G is non-planar then there *always* exists a vertex v such that $\beta_v \neq r_v$.

[1] A *torsor* for a group H is a set S together with a simply transitive action of H on S, i.e. an action such that for every $x, y \in S$ there is a unique $h \in H$ for which $h \cdot x = y$. The existence of such an action implies, in particular, that $|H| = |S|$.

[2] In this paper we distinguish between a *planar graph*, which is a graph G that can be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with no crossings, and a *plane graph*, which is a graph G together with such an embedding.

We also investigate the relationship between the Bernardi process and planar duality. It is known that if G is a planar graph then there is a canonical isomorphism $\Psi : \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star)$ and a canonical bijection $\sigma : S(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(G^\star)$. It is thus natural to ask whether the Bernardi torsor is compatible with these isomorphisms. We prove that this is indeed the case:

(4) (Theorem 6.1) If G is planar, the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \times S(G) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & S(G) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Psi \times \sigma} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \sigma} \\ \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star) \times S(G^\star) & \xrightarrow{\beta^\star} & S(G^\star) \end{array}$$

Combined with (3), this proves that the rotor-routing torsor is also compatible with planar duality (which the first author had conjectured at the 2013 AIM workshop). An independent proof (not going through the Bernardi process) of the compatibility of the rotor-routing torsor with planar duality has recently been given by [CGM+15].

A key technical insight which we use repeatedly is an interpretation of Bernardi's bijections in terms of *(integral) break divisors* in the sense of [ABKS14]. Break divisors are in canonical bijection with elements of $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$, where g is the *genus* of G in the sense of [BN07], and $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$ is canonically a torsor for $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$. Among other things, we use break divisors to give a different proof from the one in [Ber08] that Bernardi's maps are in fact bijections. In particular, we are able to give a new family of *bijective proofs* of the Matrix-Tree Theorem.

The Bernardi and rotor-routing processes are defined quite differently, so it seems rather miraculous that the two stories parallel one another so closely, intertwining in the planar case and diverging in general. It is a strangely beautiful tale which still appears to hold some mysteries.

The plan of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we review the necessary background material, including Picard groups, break divisors, ribbon graphs, rotor-routing, and the Bernardi process. In Section 3 we give our new proof that Bernardi's maps are bijections, and in Section 4 we define the action β_v and establish (1). In Section 5 we investigate planarity and establish (2), and in Section 6 we study the relationship between planar duality and the Bernardi process and establish (4). Finally, in Section 7, we relate the Bernardi and rotor-routing torsors in the planar case and establish (3).

2. Background

2.1. **Graphs, divisors, and linear equivalence.** Let G be a *graph* (by which we mean a finite connected multigraph without loop edges) with vertex set $V(G)$ of size

n and edge set $E(G)$. We denote by $\vec{e}$ an edge $e \in E(G)$ together with an orientation, and by $(\vec{e})^{\mathrm{op}}$ the edge e with the opposite orientation.

Following [BN07], we define the group of *divisors* on G, denoted $\mathrm{Div}(G)$, to be the free abelian group on $V(G)$. The *degree* of a divisor $D = \sum_{v \in V(G)} a_v(v)$, which we write as a formal integer linear combination of vertices, is defined to be $\sum a_v$, and the set of divisors of degree d is denoted $\mathrm{Div}^d(G)$.

Let $M(G)$ be the set of functions $f : V(G) \to \mathbb{Z}$. We define the group of *principal divisors* on G, denoted $\mathrm{Prin}(G)$, to be $\{\Delta f \ : \ f \in M(G)\}$, where

$$\Delta f = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \left(\sum_{e=vw} (f(v) - f(w)) \right) (v)$$

is the Laplacian of f considered as a divisor on G. We say that two divisors D and D' are *linearly equivalent*, written $D \sim D'$, if $D - D' \in \mathrm{Prin}(G)$.

For each $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ we let $\mathrm{Pic}^d(G)$ be the set of linear equivalence classes of degree d divisors on G. In particular, $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G) = \mathrm{Div}^0(G)/\mathrm{Prin}(G)$ is a *group* which acts simply and transitively by addition on each $\mathrm{Pic}^d(G)$. By basic linear algebra, the cardinality of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ (and hence of every $\mathrm{Pic}^d(G)$) is the determinant of any $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ principal sub-minor of the Laplacian matrix of G, where $n = |V(G)|$.

We denote by $[D] \in \mathrm{Pic}^d(G)$ the linear equivalence class of a divisor $D \in \mathrm{Div}^d(G)$.

2.2. **Break divisors.** Let G be a graph, and let $g = g_{\mathrm{comb}}(G)$ be the *combinatorial genus*[3] of G, defined as $\#E(G) - \#V(G) + 1$. If T is a spanning tree of G, then there are exactly g edges $e_1, \ldots, e_g$ of G not belonging to T. A divisor of the form $D = \sum_{i=1}^{g}(v_i)$, where v_i is an endpoint of e_i, is called a *T-break divisor*. A *break divisor*[4] is a T-break divisor for some spanning tree T. We denote by $B(G)$ the set of break divisors on G. We will sometimes say that D is *compatible with* T to mean that D is a T-break divisor.

The following important fact is proved in [ABKS14, Theorem 4.25]; it implies, in particular, the surprising fact that the number of break divisors on G is equal to the number of spanning trees:

Theorem 2.1. *Every element of* $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$ *is linearly equivalent to a unique break divisor.*

[3]Note that graph theorists often use the term *genus* to denote the minimal topological genus of a ribbon structure on G in the sense of §2.3 below. However, to highlight the connections with algebraic geometry in the spirit of [BN07] we will use the unmodified term *genus* to denote the combinatorial genus of G.

[4]In [ABKS14], these are called *integral break divisors*. We omit the adjective 'integral' because non-integral break divisors play no role in this paper.

2.3. **Ribbon graphs.** A *ribbon graph* is a finite graph G together with a cyclic ordering of the edges around each vertex. A ribbon structure on G gives an embedding of G into a canonical (up to homeomorphism) closed orientable surface S. (The surface S is obtained by first thickening G to a compact orientable surface-with-boundary R and then gluing a disk to each boundary component of R.) Conversely, every such embedding gives rise to a ribbon structure on G. Ribbon structures are therefore sometimes called *combinatorial embeddings*. (A good reference for basic combinatorial properties of ribbon graphs is [Tho95].) We refer to the genus of S as the *topological genus* $g_{\text{top}}(G)$ of G, and say that G is *planar* if $g_{\text{top}}(G) = 0$.

Equivalently, a planar ribbon graph is one which can be embedded in the Euclidean plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ without crossings in such a way that the ribbon structure on G is induced by the natural counterclockwise orientation[5] on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Every closed orientable surface S can be cut along a collection of loops to give a polygon P, and conversely by identifying certain pairs of sides of P one can recover the surface S. In fact, as is well-known (see e.g. [Hen94, p. 126]), one can arrange for the labeling of the edges of P as one traverses the perimeter counterclockwise to have the form

$$P = a_1 b_1 a_1^{-1} b_1^{-1} \cdots a_g b_g a_g^{-1} b_g^{-1}. \tag{2.2}$$

(In this labeling, a_i and a_i^{-1} get glued together with opposite orientations, and similarly for b_i and b_i^{-1}.) We define the *genus* of P to be the integer g, which is also the genus of S.

In particular (by avoiding the vertices), every ribbon graph G can be drawn inside a *fundamental polygon* P whose boundary is glued as in (2.2), with all vertices of G lying on the interior of G (see Figure 6 for an example). One may take the genus of P to be the topological genus of G.

2.4. **Planar duality.** It is well-known that every plane graph has a *planar dual* $G^\star$ whose vertices correspond to faces of $G^\star$ and whose edges are dual to edges of G.[6] Duality for plane graphs has the following well-known properties:

(1) There is a canonical isomorphism $G^{\star\star} \cong G$.
(2) There is a canonical bijection $\psi : S(G) \to S(G^\star)$ sending a spanning tree T of G to the spanning tree T^* whose edges are dual to the edges of G *not* in T.
(3) There is a isomorphism of groups $\Psi = \Psi_{\mathcal{O}} : \text{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Pic}^0(G^\star)$ depending on the choice of an orientation $\mathcal{O}$ of the plane.

[5]There are two ways to orient $\mathbb{R}^2$, and for most of this paper we will implicitly or explicitly work with the counterclockwise orientation. However, for planar duality it is important to consider both orientations.

[6]In general $G^\star$ will have loop edges, which we exclude in this paper, so for duality considerations we assume that G has no bridges (edges whose removal disconnects the graph).

The isomorphism in (3) is obtained as follows. The choice of $\mathcal{O}$ allows us to identify directed edges of G with directed edges of $G^\star$ in a natural way: if $\vec{e}$ is a directed edge of G then locally, near the crossing of e and $e^\star$, one obtains an orientation on $e^\star$ by following the given orientation of the plane. This identification affords an isomorphism between the lattice C_I of integral 1-chains on G and the lattice $C_I^\star$ of integral 1-chains on $G^\star$. By [BdlHN97, Proposition 8], there is also a canonical isomorphism between the *lattice of integer flows* Z_I for G and the *lattice of integer cuts* $B_I^\star$ for $G^\star$, and vice-versa. And by [Big97, Proposition 28.2], there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{C_I}{Z_I \oplus B_I}$ whose inverse is induced by the boundary map $\partial : C_I \to \mathrm{Div}^0(G)$. We thus obtain an isomorphism $\Psi : \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star)$ induced by the composition

$$\mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{C_I}{Z_I \oplus B_I} \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{C_I^\star}{Z_I^\star \oplus B_I^\star} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star).$$

If G is a planar ribbon graph (with respect to some orientation $\mathcal{O}$ of the plane), the natural way to define a dual planar ribbon graph $G^\star$ is to use the *opposite* orientation $\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}$ to define the cyclic ordering around each vertex of the dual graph. With this convention, facts (1)-(3) above also hold for planar ribbon graphs (with the map in (3) now being canonical).

2.5. **Rotor-routing.** We give a quick summary of some basic facts about rotor-routing from [HLM$^+$08] and [CCG15] which will be needed for our proof of Theorem 7.1.

Let G be a ribbon graph, and choose a *sink vertex* y of G. The *rotor-routing model* is a deterministic process on *states* (ρ, x), where ρ is a *rotor configuration* (i.e., an assignment of an outgoing edge $\rho[z]$ to each vertex $z \neq y$ of G) and x is a vertex of G, which one thinks of as the position of a *chip* which moves along the graph. Each step of the rotor-routing process consists of replacing (ρ, x) with a new state (ρ', x'), where ρ' is obtained from ρ by rotating the rotor $\rho[x]$ to the next edge $\widetilde{\rho[x]}$ in the cyclic order at x and x' is the other endpoint of $\widetilde{\rho[x]}$. We think of the chip as moving from x to x' along the edge $\widetilde{\rho[x]}$ in the process.

Given a root vertex y, a vertex x, and a spanning tree T, one defines a new spanning tree $((x) - (y))_y(T)$ as follows. Orienting the edges of T towards y gives a rotor configuration ρ_T on G. Place a chip at the initial vertex x and iterate the rotor-routing process starting with the pair (ρ, x) until the chip first reaches y (which it always does, see [HLM$^+$08, Lemma 3.6]). Call the resulting pair (σ, y). Denote the pairs at each step of the rotor-routing process by $(\rho_0, x_0) = (\rho, x), (\rho_1, x_1), \ldots, (\rho_k, x_k) = (\sigma, y)$. Define $S_0 = T$, and for $i = 0, \ldots, k-1$ define a subset $S_{i+1} \subset E(G)$ by $S_{i+1} = S_i \backslash \rho_i[x_i] \cup \widetilde{\rho_i[x_i]}$. Although it is not in general true that each S_{i+1} is a



FIGURE 1. An example of the rotor-routing process.

spanning tree[7], it is proved in [HLM+08] that S_k is a spanning tree T', and we define $((x)-(y))_y(T) = T'$. (See Figure 1 for an example.) It is proved in [HLM+08] that this action extends by linearity to an action of $\mathrm{Div}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$, which by *loc. cit.* is trivial on $\mathrm{Prin}(G)$ and descends to a simply transitive action r_y of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$.

The following result is proved in [CCG15]:

Theorem 2.3. *The action r_y is independent of the root vertex y if and only if the ribbon graph G is planar.*

An important ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.3 is the relationship between rotor-routing and unicycles. A *unicycle* is a state (ρ, x) such that ρ contains exactly one directed cycle $C(\rho)$ and x lies on this cycle.

Suppose G has m edges and (ρ, x) is a unicycle on G. By [HLM+08, Lemma 4.9][8], if we iterate the rotor-routing process $2m$ times starting at the state (ρ, x), the chip traverses each edge of G exactly once in each direction, each rotor makes exactly one full turn, and the stopping state is (ρ, x). Using this, one sees that the relation on unicycles defined by $(\rho, x) \sim (\rho', x')$ iff (ρ', x') can be obtained from (ρ, x) by iterating the rotor-routing process some number of times is an equivalence relation.

Given a unicycle (ρ, x), denote by $\bar{\rho}$ the configuration obtained from ρ by reversing the edges of C and keeping all other rotors the same. One says that the unicycle (ρ, x) is *reversible* if $(\rho, x) \sim (\bar{\rho}, x)$. By [CCG15, Proposition 7], the notion of reversibility is intrinsic to the directed cycle $C(\rho)$, and does not actually depend on ρ or x; in other words, if (x, ρ) and (x', ρ') are unicycles with $C(\rho) = C(\rho')$, then (x, ρ) is reversible iff (x', ρ') is. It therefore makes sense to talk about reversibility of directed cycles in a ribbon graph G. The importance of this concept stems from [CCG15, Proposition

[7]In general, S_{i+1} will either be a spanning tree or the disjoint union of a cycle C' and a tree T' such that $C' \cup T'$ contains every vertex of G.

[8]The authors of [HLM+08] define rotor-routing slightly differently than we do here: instead of using a configuration with a sink, they use "sink-free rotor routing". One can easily translate back and forth between our process and theirs by adding an outgoing edge to the sink; this makes the configuration a unicycle instead of a spanning tree. During any stage of the process, sink-free rotor-routing takes unicycles to unicycles [HLM+08, Lemma 3.3].



FIGURE 2. The Bernardi tour associated to two different spanning trees (shown in red), along with the corresponding break divisors. The ribbon structure on G is induced by the counterclockwise orientation of the plane.

9], which asserts that the ribbon graph G is planar if and only if every directed cycle of G is reversible.

2.6. **The Bernardi process.** Let G be a ribbon graph, and fix a pair (v, e) (which we refer to as the *initial data*) consisting of a vertex v and an edge e adjacent to v. In this section, we recall the *tour* of G which Bernardi [Ber08, §3.1] associates to the initial data (v, e) together with a spanning tree T, and describe how to associate a break divisor to this tour.

Let T be a spanning tree of G. The tour $\tau_{(v,e)}(T)$ is a traversal of T which begins and ends at v. Informally, the tour is obtained by walking along edges belonging to T and cutting through edges not belonging to T, beginning with e and proceeding according to the ribbon structure.[9] (See Figure 2.)

More formally, the tour is a sequence

$$\tau_{(v,e)}(T) = (v_0, \vec{e}_1, v_1, \vec{e}_2, \ldots, \vec{e}_k, v_k)$$

where each v_i is a vertex of G and $\vec{e}_i$ is a directed edge of G leading to v_i. We set $v_0 = v$. If $e \in T$, we define e_1 to be e, and if $e \notin T$, we let e_1 be the first edge after e in the cyclic ordering around v. Let v_1 be the other endpoint (besides e_0) of e_1. The (v_i, e_i) for $2 \leq i \leq k$ are defined inductively by declaring that $e_i = (v_{i-1}, v_i)$ is the first edge after e_{i-1} belonging to T in the cyclic ordering of the edges around v_{i-1}. The tour stops when each edge of T has been included twice among the e_i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, once with each orientation; necessarily we will have $v_k = v$. Note that different choices of initial data give rise to tours which are cyclic shifts of one another.

[9]From a topological point of view, the tour $\tau_{(v,e)}(T)$ is obtained by traversing the boundary of a small ϵ-neighborhood of T in the oriented surface S on which the ribbon graph is embedded.

The break divisor $\beta_{(v,e)}(T)$ associated to the tour is obtained by dropping a chip at the corresponding vertex each time the tour first cuts through an edge not belonging to T. In other words, for each edge e' not in the spanning tree, let $\{\vec{e}_i, \vec{e}_j\}$ be the two oriented edges whose underlying unoriented edge is e', with $i < j$, and set $\eta_{v,e}(e') := v_{i-1}$. We define

$$\beta_{(v,e)}(T) := \sum_{e' \notin T} (\eta_{v,e}(e')).$$

The amazing fact implicitly discovered by Bernardi is that the association $T \mapsto \beta_{(v,e)}(T)$ gives a *bijection* between spanning trees of G and break divisors.[10] In the next section, we give a proof which is different from Bernardi's that $\beta_{(v,e)}$ is bijective. In addition to making the present paper more self-contained, our proof of Bernardi's theorem involves a new recursive procedure which might be of independent interest. However, the reader already familiar with Bernardi's proof of Theorem 41(5) (which in particular makes use of his Propositions 18 and 34) may safely skip the next section if desired.

3. The Bernardi map is bijective

Let $S(G)$ denote the set of spanning trees of G and let $B(G)$ denote the set of break divisors of G, which is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$. As in the previous section, we fix a pair (v, e) consisting of a vertex v and an edge e adjacent to v. In this section we give a new proof of the fact that the map $\beta := \beta_{(v,e)} : S(G) \to B(G)$ is bijective by explicitly constructing a left inverse α_L and a right inverse α_R to β. It follows *a posteriori* that $\alpha_L = \alpha_R$ and both are two-sided inverses to β, which is therefore a bijection.

3.1. **The right inverse.** Let D be a break divisor and fix a pair (v, e) consisting of a vertex v and an edge e adjacent to v. To define the map $\alpha_R : B(G) \to S(G)$, we will inductively reconstruct a spanning tree T with $\beta(T) = D$, along with a corresponding Bernardi tour which traverses T. Since the tour is obtained by walking along edges belonging to T and cutting through edges not belonging to T, but in this case we don't know T, our challenge is to use the break divisor D to figure out which edges to walk along and which to cut through. The solution is that we will cut through an edge e' if removing that edge from the graph and subtracting a chip from D at the current vertex gives a break divisor D' on the resulting graph G'; otherwise we walk along e' and add it to the spanning tree which we're building.

More formally, $\alpha_R(D)$ is defined to be the output of Algorithm 1 below.

Proposition 3.1. *Let G be a graph and D a break divisor on G. Then $\alpha_R(D)$ is a spanning tree of G and $\beta(\alpha_R(D)) = D$.*

[10] Bernardi phrases his result (Theorem 41(5)) in terms of out-degree sequences of orientations, but in view of the results of [ABKS14] the two points of view are equivalent.

Input: A connected graph G and a break divisor $D \in \mathrm{Div}^g(G)$.
Output: A spanning tree T.

Set $i := 0$, $T := \emptyset$,$v' := v$, and $e' := e$.

while $T \neq G$ **do**
  Let w' be the other endpoint (besides v') of e'.
  Let G' be the graph of genus $g' := g - 1$ obtained from G by deleting e'.
  Define $D' := D - (v') \in \mathrm{Div}^{g'}(G')$.
  if *G' is connected and D' is a break divisor on G' and $e' \notin T$* **then**
    Replace G by G', D by D', and e' by the edge following it in the (induced) cyclic ordering around v' on G'.
  else
    Replace T by $T \cup \{e'\}$, v' by w', and e' by the edge following it in the cyclic ordering around w' on G'.
  end
end

Output T.

Algorithm 1: Right inverse to the Bernardi map

Proof. We will show that Algorithm 1 terminates (and hence α_R is well-defined), and that $\alpha_R(D)$ is a spanning tree. The fact that $\beta(\alpha_R(D)) = D$ is then clear from the definitions of α_R and β.

The termination of Algorithm 1 follows easily from the fact that T is always a tree at every stage of the algorithm (that T is always connected is clear, and we will prove in a moment that T never contains a cycle). To prove that $S := \alpha_R(D)$ is a spanning tree, we must show that S contains every vertex of G and does not contain a cycle. The former follows easily from the latter, so the heart of the matter is to show that S does not contain a cycle.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that S contains a cycle, and let C be the first cycle produced by the algorithm. At the stage of running Algorithm 1 where the cycle C has just been created, we have a break divisor $\tilde{D}$ on a subgraph $\tilde{G}$ of our original graph containing C. Let $\tilde{T}$ be a spanning tree of $\tilde{G}$ which is compatible with $\tilde{D}$, and let f be an edge of C not belonging to $\tilde{T}$. Let w' be the value of v' when Algorithm 1 decides to include the edge f in S. By construction, w' is an endpoint of f.

Since f is not cut through, $\tilde{D} - (w')$ is not a break divisor on $\tilde{G} \backslash f$. By the definition of compatibility, if w denotes the other endpoint of f, then $\tilde{D} - (w)$ must be a break divisor on $\tilde{G}$. Let f' be the other edge of C having w as an endpoint, and let w'' be the other endpoint of f'. If we traverse f' for the first time starting from w'' rather than

w, then there must be another cycle C' formed before C, a contradiction. Therefore at some stage of the algorithm $v' = w$ and we decide to include f' in the spanning tree rather than cutting through it at w. But this contradicts the fact that $\tilde{D} - (w)$ is a break divisor on $\tilde{G}$.

Finally, suppose that S does not contain every vertex of G. Since we have just proved that S is a tree, it is easy to see that for every vertex $w \in S$ and every edge f adjacent to w, Algorithm 1 either includes f in S or cuts through f. It follows that at some stage of Algorithm 1 we must have cut through an edge f whose removal disconnects G, a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.2. *The Bernardi map $\beta : S(G) \to B(G)$ is surjective.*

Remark 3.3. There is an efficient (polynomial-time) algorithm for deciding whether or not a given divisor on a graph is a break divisor; see [Bac14].

3.2. **The left inverse.** It is not clear how to prove directly that the map α_R constructed in the previous subsection is injective. Instead, we prove injectivity by defining a different map α_L which is constructed in exactly the same way as α_R but *touring the graph in the opposite direction* and subtracting a chip from the endpoint of e' opposite v' when standing at v' and deciding whether to walk along e' or cut through it. More formally, we define $\alpha_L(D)$ to be the output of Algorithm 2 below.

Input: A connected graph G and a break divisor $D \in \mathrm{Div}^g(G)$.
Output: A spanning tree T.

Let e_0 be the edge preceding e in the cyclic ordering around v.
Set $i := 0$, $T' := \emptyset$,$v' := v$, and $e' := e_0$.

while $T \neq G$ **do**
  Let w' be the other endpoint (besides v') of e'.
  Let G' be the graph of genus $g' := g - 1$ obtained from G by deleting e'.
  Define $D' := D - (w') \in \mathrm{Div}^{g'}(G')$.
  if *G' is connected and D' is a break divisor on G' and $e' \notin T$* **then**
    Replace G by G', D by D', and e' by the edge preceding it in the (induced) cyclic ordering around v' on G'.
  else
    Replace T by $T \cup \{e'\}$, v' by w', and e' by the edge preceding it in the cyclic ordering around w' on G'.
  end
end

Output T.

Algorithm 2: Left inverse to the Bernardi map

Proposition 3.4. *Let G be a graph.*

(1) *If D is a break divisor on G then $\alpha_L(D)$ is a spanning tree of G.*
(2) *If T is a spanning tree of G then $\alpha_L(\beta(T)) = T$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove (2), since we already know by Corollary 3.2 that $\beta : S(G) \to B(G)$ is surjective.

To establish (2), let T be a spanning tree and let $A_1, \ldots, A_k \subset V(G)\backslash\{v\}$ be the connected components of the complement of v (the starting vertex for the Bernardi process) in T. We may order these components so that A_i is connected to v by an edge $a_i \in T$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ follow the cyclic ordering of edges at v, with a_1 the first one visited by the Bernardi process. Thus A_k will be the last component visited by the Bernardi process, and any edge connecting A_i and A_k will be cut at the endpoint in A_i before the Bernardi process reaches A_k.

Let ψ be the inverse process described by Algorithm 2 (which induces the function α_L). By induction on the number of steps in the process, it suffices to prove that:

(a) The inverse process ψ *does* cut through each edge preceding a_k in the reverse cyclic ordering at v (starting with the edge e_0).
(b) The inverse process ψ *does not* cut through the edge a_k.

Indeed, when the inverse process ψ goes along the edge a_k to the next vertex v', we can set the base vertex for the Bernardi process to be v' and continue as before.

For (a), note that by deleting any edge before a_k in this reverse cyclic ordering, the spanning tree induced by T on the resulting graph G' is compatible with the resulting break divisor D'. So the inverse process ψ will cut through these edges.

For (b), denote by D' and G' the new break divisor and new graph obtained by cutting all edges before a_k in the process ψ. We identify T with its image in G'. Let G'_k be the induced subgraph on A_k in G', which by assumption is connected, and let g'_k be its genus (number of edges minus number of vertices plus one). By our above remarks, any edge of G' not in T which connects A_k with its complement is cut through before the Bernardi process visits A_k. It follows that $\deg(D'|_{A_k}) = g'_k$. On the other hand, it is not hard to see that for any connected subgraph $G^\star$ of G' containing G'_k and any break divisor $D^\star$ on $G^\star$, we must have $\deg(D^\star|_{A_k}) \geq g'_k$. If the edge a_k can be cut through, then by deleting a_k and subtracting 1 from D' at the endpoint of a_k belonging to A_k, we obtain a new break divisor D'' with $\deg(D''|_{A_k}) = g'_k - 1$, a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.5. *The Bernardi map $\beta : S(G) \to B(G)$ is bijective.*

Proof. Proposition 3.4 implies that β is injective, and by Corollary 3.2 it is also surjective. □

Remark 3.6. The proof of Corollary 3.5, combined with the results of [ABKS14] and [Bac14], provides another 'efficient bijective proof'[11] of Kirchhoff's Matrix-Tree Theorem in the spirit of [BS13], as well as a new algorithm for choosing a uniformly random spanning tree of G.[12]

4. The Bernardi torsor

In this section, we show how to associate a simply transitive action β_v of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$ to a pair (G, v) consisting of a ribbon graph G and a vertex v of G. This comes down to showing that two Bernardi bijections $\beta_{(v,e)}$ and $\beta_{(v,e')}$ associated to the same root vertex differ merely by translation by some element of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$. For a divisor $D \in B(G)$, we write $[D]$ for the linear equivalence class of D in $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$. Recall that $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ acts simply and transitively on $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$ by addition, and that the map $D \mapsto [D]$ gives a canonical bijection from $B(G)$ to $\mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$. From this we get a canonical simply transitive action of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $B(G)$ sending D to the unique break divisor $\gamma \cdot D$ linearly equivalent to $D + \gamma$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let v be a vertex of G.*

1. *Let e_1, e_2 be edges incident to v, and let $\beta_1 = \beta_{(v,e_1)}$ and $\beta_2 = \beta_{(v,e_2)}$ be the corresponding Bernardi bijections. Then there exists an element $\gamma_0 \in \mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ such that $\beta_2(T) = \gamma_0 \cdot \beta_1(T)$ for all $T \in S(G)$.*
2. *The action $\beta_v : \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \times S(G) \to S(G)$ defined by $\gamma \cdot T := \beta_{(v,e)}^{-1}\left(\gamma \cdot \beta_{(v,e)}(T)\right)$ for any edge e incident to v, depends only on v and not on the choice of e.*

Proof. Assuming (1) for the moment, we verify that (2) holds. We need to prove that if $\beta_1 = \beta_{(v,e_1)}$ and $\beta_2 = \beta_{(v,e_2)}$ are as in (1), then

$$\beta_1^{-1}\left(\gamma \cdot \beta_1(T)\right) = \beta_2^{-1}\left(\gamma \cdot \beta_2(T)\right).$$

To see this, observe that (1) implies $\beta_2^{-1}(x) = \beta_1^{-1}(\gamma_0^{-1} \cdot x)$ for all $x \in \mathrm{Pic}^g(G)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_2^{-1}\left(\gamma \cdot \beta_2(T)\right) &= \beta_1^{-1}\left(\gamma_0^{-1}\gamma\gamma_0 \cdot \beta_1(T)\right)\\ &= \beta_1^{-1}\left(\gamma \cdot \beta_1(T)\right)\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. (Note that we use in a crucial way the fact that $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ is abelian.)

For (1), it suffices to prove that $\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T)$ and $\beta_1(T') - \beta_2(T')$ are linearly equivalent in $\mathrm{Div}^0(G)$ for any two spanning trees T, T' of G. To do this we first derive

[11] By an *efficient bijective proof*, we mean (in this context) a bijection between $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ and the set of spanning trees of G which is efficiently computable in both directions.

[12] The results of [Bac14] are needed to prove that the inverse of the natural map $B(G) \to Pic^g(G)$ is efficiently computable. See [BS13] for an explanation of how such a bijection can be used to find random spanning trees.

a useful formula for $\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T)$. By definition, we have

$$\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T) = \sum_{f \notin T} \delta(f),$$

where $\delta(f) := \eta_{(v,e_1)}(f) - \eta_{(v,e_2)}(f)$ (considered as a divisor on G). Thus it will suffice to find a formula for $\delta(f)$ when $f \notin T$.

Let the cyclic ordering of the edges around v, starting with e_1, be

$$(e_1, a_1, \ldots, a_k, e_2, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell).$$

Let $I = \{e_1, a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$ and $J = \{e_2, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\}$. Removing v from T partitions the set $V(G)\backslash\{v\}$ into disjoint sets A and B, where A (resp. B) is the union of all vertices lying in the same connected component of $T\backslash v$ as some edge in I (resp. J). See Figure 3.

The Bernardi tours $\tau_{(v,e_1)}(T)$ and $\tau_{(v,e_2)}(T)$ are cyclic shifts of each other, the difference being that $\tau_{(v,e_1)}(T)$ traverses the A-components of T followed by the B-components, while the reverse is true for $\tau_{(v,e_2)}(T)$. This shows that $\delta(f) = 0$ (i.e., the Bernardi tours $\tau_{(v,e_1)}(T)$ and $\tau_{(v,e_2)}(T)$ cut through f from the same vertex) when $f \in E(G)\backslash T$ is any one of the following:

- An edge whose endpoints both belong to A or both belong to B.
- An edge $va \in I$ with $a \in A$, or an edge $vb \in J$ with $b \in B$.

On the other hand, the following kind of edges of $G\backslash T$ make a non-trivial contribution to the difference $\delta(f) := \eta_{(v,e_1)}(f) - \eta_{(v,e_2)}(f)$ (considered as a divisor on G):

- If $f = ab$ with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ then $\delta(f) = (a) - (b)$.
- If $f = va' \in J$ with $a' \in A$ then $\delta(f) = (a') - (v)$.
- If $f = vb' \in I$ with $b' \in B$ then $\delta(f) = (v) - (b')$.

Summarizing, we obtain the following formula, where the sum is over edges not in T:

$$\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T) = \sum_{\substack{f=ab \\ a\in A, b\in B}} (a) - (b) + \sum_{\substack{f=va'\in J \\ a'\in A}} (a') - (v) + \sum_{\substack{f=vb'\in I \\ b'\in B}} (v) - (b'). \tag{4.2}$$

See Figure 3 for an example.

We now use (4.2) to prove that $\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T) \sim \beta_1(T') - \beta_2(T')$ for any two spanning trees T, T' of G. It is well-known, and follows easily from the fact that spanning trees of G form the independent sets of a matroid, that the graph $\Sigma(G)$, whose vertices are spanning trees of G and whose edges correspond to pairs $\{T, T'\}$ with $T' = (T\backslash f) \cup f'$ for some edges $f \in T\backslash T'$ and $f' \in T'\backslash T$, is connected. We may therefore assume that $T' = (T\backslash f) \cup f'$ as above.



FIGURE 3. (a) The spanning tree T is shown in red. The edges which contribute non-trivially to $\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T)$ are shown in green. (b) The Bernardi tours $\tau_1 = \tau_{(v,e_1)}(T)$ and $\tau_2 = \tau_{(v,e_2)}(T)$ differ by a cyclic shift: τ_1 begins at s_1 and τ_2 begins at s_2. (c) The difference $\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T)$.

In this case, we can give an explicit formula for the degree zero divisor

$$\delta_{T,T'} := (\beta_1(T) - \beta_2(T)) - (\beta_1(T') - \beta_2(T'))$$

which certifies that it is principal. To state the formula, we need to set some notation. Fix $v \in V(G)$. For a spanning tree T and edge $e \in T$, let $\kappa_T(e)$ denote the last edge in the unique path in T starting with e and ending at v, and let $\epsilon_T(e) \in V(G)$ be the other endpoint (besides v) of $\kappa_T(e)$. Note that $\kappa_T(e)$ is the unique edge adjacent to v belonging to the same connected component of $T\backslash\{v\}$ as e; we denote the vertices of this component by $K_T(e) \subset V(G)\backslash\{v\}$.

Applying this to our situation, where $T' = T\backslash f \cup f'$ with $f \in T\backslash T'$ and $f' \in T'\backslash T$, let χ be the characteristic function of $K_T(f) \cap K_{T'}(f')$ and let A' and B' be the analogues of A and B, respectively, when T is replaced with T'. Then a tedious but straightforward case-by-case analysis yields the following formula for $\delta_{T,T'}$:

$$\delta_{T,T'} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \epsilon_T(f), \epsilon_{T'}(f') \in A' \text{ or } \epsilon_T(f), \epsilon_{T'}(f') \in B'. \\ -\Delta\chi & \text{if } \epsilon_T(f) \in B, \epsilon_{T'}(f') \in A'. \\ \Delta\chi & \text{if } \epsilon_T(f) \in A, \epsilon_{T'}(f') \in B'. \end{cases}$$

See Figure 4 for an example.

It follows in all cases that $\delta_{T,T'} \in \mathrm{Prin}(G)$ as desired. □

Corollary 4.3. *If G is a ribbon graph and v is a vertex of G, then the action β_v defined above makes the set of spanning trees of G into a torsor for* $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$.

5. Planarity and the dependence of the Bernardi torsor on the base vertex

Given a ribbon graph G, we prove that the action β_v defined in the previous section is independent of the vertex v if and only if G is *planar*.

First, we deal with the case where G is planar:

Theorem 5.1. *If G is a planar ribbon graph, then the action β_v is independent of v, and hence defines a* canonical *action β of* $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ *on $S(G)$.*

Proof. Since G is connected by assumption, it suffices to prove that $\beta_{v_1} = \beta_{v_2}$ whenever v_2 is a neighbor of v_1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the ribbon structure corresponds to the counterclockwise orientation of the plane.

Let e_1 be an edge connecting v_1 and v_2, and let e_2 be the edge following e_1 in the cyclic ordering around v_2. (If $\deg(v_2) = 1$ then we will have $e_1 = e_2$.) By Theorem 4.1, which allows us to pick whichever edges we want in our initial data, it suffices to prove that for each spanning tree T we have $\beta_{(v_1,e_1)}(T) = \beta_{(v_2,e_2)}(T)$.

If $e_1 \in T$, then since the Bernardi tours starting with (v_1, e_1) and (v_2, e_2) are cyclic shifts of each other (they coincide other than the fact that the first tour starts with



FIGURE 4. (a) The spanning tree T' is shown in red. The edges which contribute non-trivially to $\beta_1(T') - \beta_2(T')$ are shown in green. The degree-zero divisor $\beta_1(T') - \beta_2(T')$ is also shown. (b) The divisor $\delta_{T,T'}$ is shown. Here $\epsilon_T(f) = \epsilon_{T'}(f') = w$ and $K_T(f) = K_{T'}(f') = \{w\}$. Thus $\chi = \chi_{\{w\}}$ and $\Delta\chi = \delta_{T,T'}$. Note that $w \in B \cap A'$.

e_1 and the second ends with e_1), we have $\beta_{(v_1,e_1)}(T) = \beta_{(v_2,e_2)}(T)$. We may therefore assume that $e_1 \notin T$. In this case, $T \cup e_1$ contains a unique simple cycle $C = C_{T,e_1}$, called the *fundamental cycle* associated to T and e_1. Since G is planar, the edges other than e_1 which are not in the spanning tree T can be partitioned into two disjoint subsets: the edges E_{in} lying *inside* C and the edges E_{out} lying *outside* C.

The Bernardi process associated to the initial data (v_1, e_1) will cut through e_1, then cut through all of the edges in E_{in}, then cut through all the edges in E_{out}, touring



FIGURE 5. The tours associated to (v_1, e_1) and (v_2, e_2), respectively, for the planar graph G and the spanning tree T (in red).

around T in the process. The Bernardi process associated to the initial data (v_2, e_2) will cut through all of the edges in E_{out}, then cut through e_1, then cut through all the edges in E_{in}, touring around T in the process. (See Figure 5 for an example.)

It follows that not only are the tours $\tau_{(v_i,e_i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$ the same up to a cyclic shift, they also cut through edges not in T in exactly the same way. In particular, $\beta_{(v_1,e_1)} = \beta_{(v_2,e_2)}$. □

Next, we treat the non-planar case:

Theorem 5.2. *If G is a non-planar ribbon graph, then there are vertices v, v' of G with $\beta_v \neq \beta_{v'}$.*

Proof. By the discussion in Section 2.3, G has a polygonal representation inside a fundamental polygon

$$P = a_1 b_1 a_1^{-1} b_1^{-1} \cdots a_g b_g a_g^{-1} b_g^{-1}$$

which we may assume to have *minimal genus* among all such representations. We may also assume that the drawing of G inside P has the minimum possible number of edges passing through the polygon P.

Let $a = a_1, b = b_1$. Since G is non-planar, we may assume that there are edges e and e' of G which intersect boundary edges a, a^{-1} and b, b^{-1} of P, respectively.

Let G_0 be the complement in G of all edges which pass through a or b. Then G_0 is connected, since otherwise one could redraw G by changing the relative position of the components of G_0 and obtain a polygonal representation that contradicts the minimality of G and P.

Since G_0 is connected, there exists a spanning tree T_1 of G contained in G_0. Let $C = C_{T_1,e}$, let $e^\star$ be an edge of $T_1 \cap C$ (so in particular $e^\star$ does not intersect a or b), and let $T_2 = T_1 \cup e \backslash e^\star$. Without loss of generality, we may orient C and label the endpoints of $e, e^\star$ so that $\vec{e} = (x, y)$ and $(\vec{e})^\star = (x^\star, y^\star)$ are oriented consistently in C. Let $e^{\star\star}$

be the edge following $e^\star$ in the cyclic orientation around $y^\star$ and consider the Bernardi maps β_1 and β_2 arising from the initial data $(x^\star, e^\star)$ and $(y^\star, e^{\star\star})$, respectively.

Since $e^\star \in T_1$, we know that

$$\beta_1(T_1) - \beta_2(T_1) = 0.$$

On the other hand, the Bernardi tours $\tau_{(x^\star,e^\star)}(T_2)$ and $\tau_{(y^\star,e^{\star\star})}(T_2)$ have the property that for each edge e' not in T_2, $\eta_{(x^\star,e^\star)}(e') = \eta_{(y^\star,e^{\star\star})}(e')$ if and only if e' does not pass through b and b^{-1}. Thus

$$\beta_1(T_2) - \beta_2(T_2) = \sum_i \left((c_i) - (d_i)\right),$$

where (c_i, d_i) are the edges of G passing through b and b^{-1}, oriented so that c_i lies on the path from $x^\star$ to $y^\star$ in the Bernardi tour of spanning tree T_2 with initial data $(x^\star, e^\star)$. (See Figure 6 for an example.)

The divisor $\sum_i ((c_i) - (d_i))$ is not equal to zero; indeed, since G has no crossings inside the polygon P, if $\sum_i (c_i) = \sum_i (d_i)$ then in fact $c_i = d_i$ for all i, where we order the c_i in the direction of b and the d_i in the direction of b^{-1}. But this would contradict the fact that $g \geq 1$ and G is loopless.

We next claim that the divisor $D := \sum_i ((c_i) - (d_i))$ is not *linearly equivalent* to 0. To see this, suppose for the sake of contradiction that

$$\sum_i \left((c_i) - (d_i)\right) = \Delta f \tag{5.3}$$

with $f \in M(G)$.

Let A be the set of vertices where f achieves its maximum value, and let H be a connected component of the induced subgraph $G[A]$. By (5.3) and the definition of the Laplacian operator Δ, every edge connecting H to its complement must be of the form (c_i, d_i). Thus the set of edges of the form (c_i, d_i) forms a cut between H and its complement. But in this case we can redraw the embedding of G by moving H, obtaining a polygonal representation which contradicts the minimality of G and P. □

6. Compatibility of the Bernardi torsor with planar duality

If G is a planar ribbon graph, we show that the natural action of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$ is compatible with planar duality:

Theorem 6.1. *Let G be a bridgeless planar ribbon graph. Then the natural actions of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ on $S(G)$ and of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star)$ on $S(G^\star)$ defined by the Bernardi process are identified with one another via the canonical isomorphism $\Psi : \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star)$*



FIGURE 6. An example illustrating the proof of Theorem 5.2. In this example, $\beta_1(T_2) - \beta_2(T_2) = (c) - (d)$.

and the canonical bijection $\sigma : S(G) \to S(G^\star)$ defined in Section 2.4. In other words, the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Pic}^0(G) \times S(G) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & S(G) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Psi \times \sigma} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \sigma} \\ \mathrm{Pic}^0(G^\star) \times S(G^\star) & \xrightarrow{\beta^\star} & S(G^\star) \end{array}$$

Proof. Fix some arbitrary initial data (v, e) and $(v^\star, e^\star)$ for the Bernardi processes on G and $G^\star$, and denote by $\beta : S(G) \to B(G)$ and $\beta^\star : S(G^\star) \to B(G^\star)$ the corresponding Bernardi maps. We need to prove that for any spanning trees T_1 and T_2 in $S(G)$ and their corresponding dual spanning trees $T_1^\star$ and $T_2^\star$ in $S(G^\star)$, we have

$$\Psi([\beta(T_2) - \beta(T_1)]) = [\beta^\star(T_2^\star) - \beta^\star(T_1^\star)].$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that T_2 is obtained from T_1 by adding an edge $e_1 \notin T_1$ and deleting an edge $e_2 \in T_1$ from the fundamental cycle $C = C_{T_1, e_1}$. One checks easily that $T_2^\star$ is obtained from $T_1^\star$ by adding $e_2^\star$ and deleting $e_1^\star$.

We may assume without loss of generality that the ribbon structure on G corresponds to the counterclockwise orientation on the plane. Orient the cycle C counterclockwise, and let $\vec{e}_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $\vec{e}_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ be the orientations of e_1 and e_2, respectively, which are compatible with the orientation of C.

By Theorem 5.1, we may assume without loss of generality that the initial data for the Bernardi process on G are $(v, e) = (x_1, e_1)$.

Deleting the edge e_2 from T_1 (or, alternatively, deleting the edge e_1 from T_2) defines a partition of $V(G)$ into disjoint subsets A and B, where A consists of all vertices on the Bernardi tour from y_1 to x_2 which follow the orientation of the cycle, together with the vertices connecting to this path through $T_1 \backslash \{v\}$, and B consists of all vertices on the Bernardi tour from y_2 to x_1, together with the vertices connecting to this path



FIGURE 7. (a),(b): The Bernardi tours $\tau_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_1)$ and $\tau_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_2)$ associated to two different spanning trees (shown in red), and their associated break divisors. (c): The difference $\beta_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_2) - \beta_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_1)$ between the break divisors associated to T_2 and T_1. The fundamental cycle $C = C_{T_1,e_1}$ is shown in red.

through $T_1 \backslash \{v\}$. Let $(a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_k, b_k)$ be the oriented edges of G not belonging to $T_1 \cup T_2$ which connect vertices in A to vertices in B and lie on the *inside* of the cycle C. We claim that

$$\beta(T_2) - \beta(T_1) = \sum_i ((a_i) - (b_i)) + (x_2) - (x_1). \tag{6.2}$$

Indeed, we can write the tour $\tau_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_1)$ as

$$\tau_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_1) = (\alpha_1, (\vec{e_2})^{\mathrm{op}}, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \vec{e_2}, \alpha_4),$$

where α_1 goes from x_1 to y_2 inside C, α_2 goes from x_2 to y_1 inside C, α_3 goes from y_1 to x_2 outside C, and α_4 goes from y_2 to x_1 outside C. An examination of the Bernardi process shows that

$$\tau_{(x_1,e_1)}(T_2) = (\vec{e_1}, \alpha_3, \alpha_2, (\vec{e_1})^{\mathrm{op}}, \alpha_1, \alpha_4),$$

and (6.2) follows easily. The point here is that there are no edges joining "inside" to "outside" vertices, and the "outside-to-outside" edges, which are cut during $\alpha_3 \cup \alpha_4$, are traversed in the same order in the Bernardi tours associated to T_1 and T_2. Thus



FIGURE 8. An illustration of the proof of Theorem 6.1.

the difference $\beta(T_2)-\beta(T_1)$ comes from the "inside-to-inside" edges joining A and B, which are cut during $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ and are traversed in the opposite order in the Bernardi tours associated to T_1 and T_2. See Figure 7 for an example.

We can perform a similar calculation on the dual side. Orient $e_1^\star$ so that $(\vec{e}_1)^\star = (x_1^\star, y_1^\star)$ is obtained from $\vec{e}_1$ by a counterclockwise rotation, and orient the fundamental cycle $C^\star = C_{T_1^\star, e_2^\star}$ consistently with $(\vec{e}_1)^\star$. Let $(\vec{e}_2)^\star = (x_2^\star, y_2^\star)$ be the induced orientation on $e_2^\star$.

Case 1: $C^\star$ is oriented *clockwise*.

Deleting the edge $e_1^\star$ from $T_1^\star$ defines a partition of $V(G^\star)$ into disjoint subsets $A^\star$ and $B^\star$ with $x_2^\star, y_1^\star \in A^\star$ and $x_1^\star, y_2^\star \in B^\star$. Let $(a_1^\star, b_1^\star), \dots, (a_\ell^\star, b_\ell^\star)$ be the oriented edges of $G^\star$ not belonging to $T_1^\star \cup T_2^\star$ which connect vertices in $A^\star$ to vertices in $B^\star$ and which lie on the inside of $C^\star$. Then the exact same calculation as above, with initial data $(x_1^\star, e_1^\star)$, shows that

$$\beta^\star(T_2^\star) - \beta^\star(T_1^\star) = \sum_i ((b_i^\star) - (a_i^\star)) + (x_1^\star) - (x_2^\star). \tag{6.3}$$

See Figure 8 for an illustration of the situation.

Define $\lambda = \vec{e}_1 + \mu + \nu \in C_I$, where μ is the sum of all the oriented edges along the directed path in C from y_1 to x_2 and ν is the sum of all the oriented edges (b_i, a_i). By (6.2), we have $\partial(\lambda) = \beta(T_2) - \beta(T_1)$, where $\partial : C_I \to \mathrm{Div}^0(G)$ is as in §2.4.

Under the natural duality isomorphism from C_I to $C_I^\star$, one checks easily that:

- $\mu^\star$ is the sum of all the oriented edges $(a_i^\star, b_i^\star)$ and
- $\nu^\star$ is the sum of all the oriented edges along the directed path in $C^\star$ from $x_2^\star$ to $y_1^\star$.

By (6.3), we have

$$\partial(\lambda^\star) = \partial((x_1^\star, y_1^\star) + \mu^\star + \nu^\star) = \sum_i ((b_i^\star) - (a_i^\star)) + (x_1^\star) - (x_2^\star) = \beta^\star(T_2^\star) - \beta^\star(T_1^\star),$$

which finishes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2: $C^\star$ is oriented *counterclockwise*. The proof is omitted, since it is quite similar to Case 1. □

Remark 6.4. The first author conjectured the analogue of Theorem 6.1 for the rotor-routing process at an AIM workshop in July 2013. Together with Theorem 7.1 in the next section, Theorem 6.1 affirms our conjecture. Recently, Chan et. al. [CGM+15] have independently proved the compatibility of the rotor-routing torsor with planar duality using a different (more direct) method.

7. Comparison between the Bernardi and rotor-routing torsors

We show that given a ribbon graph G and a vertex v of G, the Bernardi torsor β_v defined in this paper and the rotor-routing torsor defined in [HLM+08] and [CCG15] are equal when G is planar. In particular, the canonical torsor structures on $S(G)$ defined by the Bernardi and rotor-routing processes are *the same* for planar ribbon graphs. We also give an example which shows that β_v can be different from r_v when G is non-planar.

7.1. The planar case.

Theorem 7.1. *Let G be a planar ribbon graph. Then the Bernardi and rotor-routing processes define the same* $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$*-torsor structure on $S(G)$.*

Proof. Let β be the Bernardi bijection associated to some initial data (v, e), and let T be a spanning tree of G. Since $\mathrm{Pic}^0(G)$ is generated by the linear equivalence classes of divisors of the form $(x) - (y)$, with $x, y \in V(G)$, it suffices to prove that if $T' = ((x) - (y))_y T$ then $\beta(T') - \beta(T) \sim (x) - (y)$ for all $x, y \in V(G)$.

By Theorem 2.3, we may assume that the root vertex for the rotor-routing process is y. Let T'' be the first spanning tree after T which appears during the rotor-routing process $((x) - (y))_y$ from T to T', and let x'' be the vertex to which the chip is sent when we reach T''. By induction on the number of rotor-routing steps, it is enough to show that $\beta(T'') - \beta(T) \sim (x) - (x'')$.

Case 1: T'' is obtained from T in just one step of rotor-routing.

In this case, T'' is obtained from T by deleting an edge e' incident to x and adding an edge e'' from x to x''. By Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, we may assume without loss of generality that the initial data for the Bernardi process are (x'', e''). If L denotes the complement in $E(G)$ of $T \cup T''$, the Bernardi tours associated to T and T'' will cut edges in L at the same endpoint. The difference between $\beta(T)$ and $\beta(T'')$ therefore arises from the fact that the tour associated to T cuts through e'' but not e' and the tour associated to T'' cuts through e' but not e''. One verifies in this way that

$$\beta(T'') - \beta(T) = (x) - (x'').$$

Case 2: T'' is obtained from T in more than one step of rotor-routing. (See Figure 9 for an example.)

In this case (referring back to the notation from Section 2.5), if $S_0 = T$ then S_1 will consist of 2 connected components A and B such that A contains a unique directed cycle C with $x \in C$ and B contains no directed cycle. Since G is planar, C is reversible. Consider the rotor-routing process which takes $(\rho_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_1}) := (\rho_1, x_1)$ to $(\rho_{\ell_2}, x_{\ell_2}) = (\bar{\rho_1}, x_1)$. By [CCG15, Proposition 6], the set L_C of vertices $v \notin C$ which are visited by this reversal process depends only on C and is contained in A. More precisely, in the course of sending the chip back to the initial vertex x_1, the reversal process reverses all the directed edges inside or on the cycle C and keeps the rest of the rotor configuration the same.

In the next step of rotor-routing, the chip will be sent to x_{ℓ_2+1}. If $x_{\ell_2+1} \notin A$ then $S_{\ell_2+1} = T''$ is a spanning tree. Otherwise, S_{ℓ_2+1} will again contain a unique directed cycle C' and the next several steps of rotor-routing will reverse this directed cycle. This process will continue a finite number of times until we reach some ℓ_t such that $x_{\ell_t+1} = x''$ and $S_{\ell_t+1} = T''$.

It follows that, during the entire process of rotor-routing from T to T'', T'' can be obtained from T by deleting an edge e' incident to x and the component B and adding an edge e'' from x_{ℓ_t} to x''. As in Case 1, we may assume that the initial data for the Bernardi process are (x'', e''), and by the same argument as Case 1 one then checks that

$$\beta(T'') - \beta(T) = (x) - (x'')$$

as desired. □

7.2. **The non-planar case.** We now give an example which shows that for non-planar ribbon graphs, the torsors β_v and ρ_v can be different. In Figure 10, the sink vertex is x'' and the chip begins at x. After one step of rotor-routing, the chip is sent to x'' and the spanning tree T is transformed into T''.



FIGURE 9. An illustration of the proof of Theorem 7.1.



FIGURE 10. Comparison of β_v and r_v for a non-planar ribbon graph.

If $\beta_{x''} = r_{x''}$, then we would have

$$\beta_{x''}(T'') - \beta_{x''}(T) \sim (x) - (x'').$$

However, setting the initial data for the Bernardi process as $(x'', (x'', x))$, we find that

$$(\beta_{x''}(T'') - \beta_{x''}(T)) - ((x) - (x'')) = (z) - (y)$$

which is not linearly equivalent to 0.

We conclude this paper with the following conjecture, one direction of which is Theorem 7.1.

Conjecture 7.2. *Let G be a ribbon graph without multiple edges. The Bernardi and rotor-routing torsors β_v and r_v agree for all v if and only if G is planar.*

The conjecture holds in numerous examples which we computed by hand.

References

[ABKS14] Y. An, M. Baker, G. Kuperberg, and F. Shokrieh. Canonical representatives for divisor classes on tropical curves and the matrix-tree theorem. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 2:e24, 25, 2014.

[Bac14] S. Backman. Riemann-Roch theory for graph orientations. Preprint available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.3309`, 27 pages, 2014.

[BdlHN97] R. Bacher, P. de la Harpe, and T. Nagnibeda. The lattice of integral flows and the lattice of integral cuts on a finite graph. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 125(2):167–198, 1997.

[Ber08] O. Bernardi. Tutte polynomial, subgraphs, orientations and sandpile model: new connections via embeddings. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 15(1):Research Paper 109, 53, 2008.

[Big97] N. Biggs. Algebraic potential theory on graphs. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 29(6):641–682, 1997.

[BN07] M. Baker and S. Norine. Riemann-Roch and Abel-Jacobi theory on a finite graph. *Adv. Math.*, 215(2):766–788, 2007.

[BS13] M. Baker and F. Shokrieh. Chip-firing games, potential theory on graphs, and spanning trees. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 120(1):164–182, 2013.

[CCG15] M. Chan, T. Church, and J. Grochow. Rotor-routing and spanning trees on planar graphs. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (11):3225–3244, 2015.

[CGM+15] M. Chan, D. Glass, M. Macauley, D. Perkinson, C. Werner, and Q. Yang. Sandpiles, spanning trees, and plane duality. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 29(1):461–471, 2015.

[Hen94] M. Henle. *A combinatorial introduction to topology*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1979 original [Freeman, San Francisco, CA; MR0550879 (81g:55001)].

[HLM+08] A. E. Holroyd, L. Levine, K. Mészáros, Y. Peres, J. Propp, and D. B. Wilson. Chip-firing and rotor-routing on directed graphs. In *In and out of equilibrium. 2*, volume 60 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 331–364. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008.

[Tho95] C. Thomassen. Embeddings and minors. In *Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2*, pages 301–349. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.

E-mail address: `mbaker@math.gatech.edu`

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA 30332-0160, USA

E-mail address: `wangyaoyeah@gmail.com`

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA 30332-0160, USA